

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 07, 2005, has been received and its contents have been carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the outstanding action. By this response, non-elected claim 6 is cancelled as the Examiner suggested. Also claim 1 has been amended to place the application in a better form for consideration. No new matter has been introduced. Meanwhile, Applicants provide the following comments in order to clarify what is presently set forth by Applicant's claimed invention and to clearly distinguish the present invention from the prior art cited by the Examiner. After entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1-5 and 7 are pending in the instant application.

Section 102 (b) Rejections

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bletscher (US Patent 5,070,495). This rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Bletscher neither discloses nor remotely suggests what is presently set forth by Applicant's claimed invention.

As the Examiner can readily appreciate, independent claim 1 of the pending application is directed to an optical power calibration method for calibrating a writing power of a Read/Write Compact Disc (CD-R/W) driven optical storage carrier player. Particularly, the method comprises, providing data to be written; before writing the data, determining a writing location of the data in the data storage area; performing an optical power calibration process in the first power calibration area when the writing location being within a predetermined portion of the data storage area; performing an optical power calibration process in the second power calibration area when the writing location being out of the predetermined portion; and controlling the access device to write the data onto the writing location of the data with a calibrated writing power. Clearly, these limitations are nowhere to be found in the Bletscher reference.

At first, Applicant would like to draw the Examiner's attention to the Fig. 2 of the present invention, wherein the inner power calibration area 40, data storage area 46, and the outer power calibration area 52 are "separated." In the present invention, depending on the data location in the data storage area 46, the optical power calibration process is performed only either in the first

power calibration area or in the second power calibration area, but NOT in the data storage area. After the calibration process is done, data provided is going to be written only in the data storage area, NOT in the power calibration areas. The Bletscher reference fails to teach such features of the present invention. At first, regardless of the tracks to record data after the calibration, Bletscher teaches, in col. 10, lines 6-14, "In any event, the first machine operation at step 170 to be performed causes the carriage 33 to move to the radially-inwardmost track 110. Within the scope of the present invention, it is a notion to seek one of the innermore radial tracks, such as either track 110 or 111, for performing an initial laser beam intensity adjustment; it is preferred that the radially inwardmost track 110 be used. Once the desired track is reached, then at step 171 the laser power is calibrated," which is different from the present invention in which the power calibration area is selected based on the locations to write data after the calibration. Second, with reference to page 7, lines 18-20, and page 8, lines 20-24 of the Office Action, Examiner noted that Bletscher discloses innermost and outermost tracks [hence first and second location of power calibration AND data area] and that Bletscher stated that outermost [outer power calibration area] and innermost tracks [inner power calibration area] are being used for power calibration AND data storage. Therefore it is easily appreciated that what Bletscher disclosed is really different from the present invention.

Further contrary to the present invention, Bletscher teaches in col. 5, lines 4-13, "The first step 11 repeatedly records a pulse pattern 12 on optical disk 30 along an ENTIRE length of a magnetooptic track. Pattern 12 is selected to be relatively low frequency (long half-wavelengths), such as using a binary data pattern 100010001, for eliminating inner-symbol interference." Clearly, binary data pattern 12, which is a test pattern used for adjusting power level of a laser and the pulse duration of the pulses for enabling symmetry in the recorded signal pattern 12 on the optical disk (col. 5, lines 16-19), is written along an entire length of the disk. Therefore Bletscher's binary data pattern 12 is unable to apply to the present invention, in which the optical power calibration process is not performed on the entire optical storage carrier, but rather only in either the inner power calibration area or the outer power calibration area.

In addition, one of the most significant differences between the present invention and Bletscher reference lies in the step of "before writing the data in the data storage area, determining a writing location of the data in the data storage area." In an embodiment, the writing location is determined by the control device 36 (step 104) before the optical power

calibration (step 106) and the data writing by the access device 32 (step 108). Then according to the result of determination of step 104, the calibration in step 106 is performed in "either" the inner power calibration area 40 or outer power calibration area 52. No data needs to be written on the data storage area before the calibration is completed in the calibration area. However, according to col. 8, lines 45-60 in Bletscher, as quoted by Examiner, "It has been found that the duration variation of the recorded signal pattern 12 is nonlinear across the recording band of optical disk 30. If a more linear variation occurs, fewer calibration tracks 110 to 114 may be used; if a greater nonlinearity is found, then a larger number of calibration tracks should be used...." Bletscher utilized the "recorded signal pattern ACROSS the recording band of optical disk" to determine which tracks perform the calibration, which is different to the present invention.

Therefore Bletscher, performing iteratively calibrations at different tracks, fails to teach the optical power calibration method in accordance with the present invention for performing an optical power calibration process in either the inner power calibration area or the outer power calibration area according to the writing location of the data. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in claim 1 as well as claims 2 and 4 which include all the limitations of claim 1 are clearly not anticipated by Bletscher and are in proper condition for allowance.

Section 103 (a) Rejections

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bletscher in view of Suga (U.S. Patent 6,418,102). This rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Suga when combined with the teaching of Bletscher fails to disclose or remotely suggest what is presently set forth by Applicants' claimed invention.

Initially, it is noted that both Claims 3 and 5 are directly dependent upon independent Claim 1 and include all the limitation thereof. Furthermore, while the patent to Suga may disclose a method and apparatus for optical disk recording which is capable of efficiently performing an optimum laser power calibration on a recordable optical disk, this reference clearly fails to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings associated with the teachings of Bletscher.

Specifically, as noted hereinabove, Bletscher fails to teach all the limitations of independent Claim 1, and while Suga discloses the carrier player controls rotation of the optical storage carrier in a constant linear velocity (CLV) manner, the combination proposed by the Examiner still fails to disclose or suggest what is presently set forth by Applicants' claimed invention. Particularly, the combination proposed by the Examiner fails to teach the step of determining a writing location of the data in the data storage area, as recited by Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in dependent claims 3 and 5 are likewise in proper condition for allowance.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bletscher in view of Ikedo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,284). This rejection is traversed because Ikedo, when combined with Bletscher, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 7.

As noted above, Bletscher fails to teach several elements of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. This shortcoming of Bletscher is not overcome by the addition of Ikedo, since no combination of the references teaches or discloses "depending on the determined writing location in the data storage area, performing an optical power calibration process either, in the first power calibration area when the writing location being within a predetermined portion of the data storage area, or in the second power calibration area when the writing location being out of the predetermined portion" as set forth in claim 1. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection to claim 7.

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending Claims 1-5, and 7 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7 Sept. - 2005

By: David O. Caplan, res. # 41,655 for
Cynthia L. Pillote
U.S. Reg. No. 42,999

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6296
(602) 382-6070 - Facsimile
cpillote@swlaw.com